

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7, and 14 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-20 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Russell-Falla teaches blocking the display of a web page (or other digital record) from a search engine link that contains a particular type of content. Weiser teaches integrating a headerless apparatus into a messaging environment. Chakrabarti teaches a web crawler that that a topic-specific library for user search. Doerre teaches generating a content taxonomy of electronic documents.

Russell-Falla, Weiser, Chakrabarti, and Doerre do not teach “using a conceptual taxonomy specifying at least one relationship between two or more concepts to associate a concept type identification with said concept”, incorporating said concept in a conceptual model “at least in part by using said concept type identification, ” and “identifying said concept at least in part by using said concept type identification of said search query,” as amended in claim 1. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification, without limitation, on page 18 line 25 – page 22 line 20. Doerre does not teach or suggest using the taxonomy of Doerre to associate a concept type identification with a concept that is included in a concept model. Chakrabarti does not teach identifying a concept using a concept type identification specified in a search query. As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Amended claim 7 recites a computer-readable medium including “instructions to associate a concept type identification with said concept identification using a conceptual taxonomy specifying at least one relationship between two or more concepts,” instructions to generate a conceptual model based upon said concept identification “at least in part by using said concept type identification,” and “instructions to identify said concept identification at least in part by using said concept type identification of said search query.” As such, claim 7 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above

Amended claim 14 recites a second module configured to “use a conceptual taxonomy specifying at least one relationship between two or more concepts to associate a concept type identification with said concept” and direct said processor to generate a conceptual model based upon said concept “at least in part by using said concept type identification,” wherein when a


search query associated with said concept type identification is received, "said concept is identified at least in part by using said concept type identification of said search query." As such, claim 14 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, claims 8-13 depend from claim 7, and claims 15-20 depend from claim 14 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12/19/06


Jong Andrew H. Park
Registration No. 56,917
V 408-973-2577
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014